R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 013 346 24 AA 000 198

INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION. NEW DIMENSIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION, NUMBER 21.

BY- HOWARD, LAWRENCE C.
DUKE UNIV., DURHAM, N.C.

REPORT NUMBER BR-6-1722-21 PUB DATE APR 67
CONTRACT OEC-2-6-061722-1742
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$2.88 72P.

DESCRIPTORS- *HIGHER EDUCATION, LITERATURE REVIEWS, *INSTITUTIONS, *COLLEGES, *COLLEGE COOPERATION, *INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION,

IN HIS REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION, THE AUTHOR FOUND THAT THE GROUPS FORMED PASS BY MANY NAMES--"CENTER," "CONSORTIUM" OR "COUNCIL," "COOPERATIVE PROGRAM," "EXCHANGE PROGRAM," AND "ASSOCIATION." THESE GROUPS FORM A CONTINUUM FROM TIGHTLY KNIT TO LOOSER OCCASIONAL TIES. THE BASIC UNIT IS A COLLEGE, EVEN THOUGH THE CHARACTERISTICS SHARED BY COLLEGES WERE FOUND TO BE LIMITED. THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND PRECEDING THE RECENT STIMULUS FROM THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 IS DESCRIBED AND MORE RECENT DEVELOPMENTS ARE ANALYZED. RESEARCH ON RECENT EFFORTS WAS FOUND DIFFICULT BECAUSE OF THE ABSENCE OF CATALOGING AND AGREED-UPON CATEGORIES. MUCH VALUABLE DATA WAS FOUND IN EPHEMERA. THE AUTHOR FOUND THAT AS HIGHER EDUCATION HAS BECOME A MAJOR AMERICAN INDUSTRY, THERE HAVE BEEN MOVES TOWARD COOPERATION TO ACHIEVE GREATER EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY. IN CONTRAST, SOME INDUSTRIAL PROGRAMS, ALTHOUGH FAR ABOVE THE MINIMUMS FOR ACCREDITATION, HAVE BEEN EXCLUDED BECAUSE THEY ARE BYPRODUCTS OF BUSINESS OR MANUFACTURING. THE PRESSURES TOWARD COOPERATION ARE DESCRIBED. THESE PRESSURES HAVE BEEN STEADY BUT UNCOORDINATED. GOVERNMENT AT ALL LEVELS HAS BEEN INVOLVED. PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS AND THE COLLEGES THEMSELVES ARE ENCOURAGING THE EFFORTS. THE AUTHOR CONCLUDES (1) INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION MUST BE SEEN AS A PROCESS, (2) ANALYSES OF THE PROCESS IS NEEDED, AND (3) THERE IS A NEED FOR INFORMATION FROM THE INSTITUTIONS, FOR COOPERATIVE STUDIES, FOR A PURPOSEFUL TAXONOMY, AND FOR A THEORETICAL FOUNDATION FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS AND TO GUIDE FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS. (AL)

BR-6-1722-21

PA 24

ED013346

NEW DIMENSIONS
in Higher Education

Number 21

INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

April, 1967

The literature research review reported in this manuscript was made possible by Contract Number OEC 2-6-061722-1742 between Duke University, Durham, North Carolina and the United States Office of Education.

AA000198

NEW DIMENSIONS
IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Number 21

INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Lawrence C. Howard

Everett H. Hopkins, Editor

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

JOHN GARDNER, Secretary
Office of Education
HAROLD HOWE II, Commissioner

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Dr. Lawrence C. Howard received his bachelor of arts degree in 1949 from Drake University, his masters degree in 1950 from Wayne State University, and his doctor of philosophy degree in 1956 from Harvard University. All of his degrees were in political science.

Currently, Dr. Howard is the Director of the Institute of Human Relations at the University of Wisconsin. The Institute, a university-wide activity, is responsible for coordinating programs in the inter-group field. Major projects include a privately financed expanded opportunities program for low income urban residents along with an Upward Bound project, urban extension cooperative interinstitutional programs under both private and federal support. The Institute is heavily engaged in research including work on cooperative programs linking "established" and "developing" colleges and on barriers to employment faced by Negroes.

Dr. Howard's most recent publication, "Teach Them the Arts of Freedom," appeared in the June 18, 1966, edition of Saturday Review.

On September 1, 1967, Dr. Howard will assume new duties as a Vice President of the Danforth Foundation in St. Louis, Missouri.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
About the Author	iii
Foreword	v
Highlights	vi
I. Survey of the Literature	1
Introduction	
Historical Background of Interinstitutional Cooperation	
The Semantics of Cooperation	
Mounting Pressures for Cooperation	
II. Analysis	24
The Problem of Understanding What is Happening	
Alternatives and Innovations: The Search for Clarity	
The Frontier: New Roles for Old Institutions	
Footnotes	35
Annotated Bibliography	42
Pressures on Higher Education	
The Interinstitutional Movement	
Cooperation Among Special Interest Groups	
Earlier Studies in Interinstitutional Cooperation	
Educational Functions	
Case Studies	
Reactions	

FOREWORD

(If and when this manuscript is published for general distribution, the Editor will gladly prepare an appropriate Foreword for the wider audience.)

HIGHLIGHTS

The literature of higher education reveals ever-expanding instances of interinstitutional cooperation, even though this device has received almost no scholarly scrutiny.

1. A primary difficulty in searching the periodical literature is the absence of agreed upon entry categories. While a few books have appeared, much of the valuable material is of a fugitive nature. A clearinghouse on current information and support for the continuing analysis of data already available is badly needed. To probe more deeply the cooperative realities will require perspectives from outside the field of education.

2. While cooperation between colleges has a long history, the widespread use of this device in higher education is new. Since 1960, cooperative patterns have been prompted by the promise of new opportunities and new remedies for plaguing problems. The product of these forces has been a rash of new associations with confusing labels.

3. The perplexing array of cooperative patterns and the uncritical acceptance of the device by college administrators make analysis necessary. The basic problem is the absence of theoretical work. Better conceptualization could produce purposeful taxonomy, distinguish incidental projects from essential programs, and make possible needed comparative studies. Cooperation needs to be seen as a process with essential quid pro quo's.

4. The search for clarity can begin through finding out what is now happening. The questions of many writers point the way: What is the impact of this device on faculty and students? How can these programs be evaluated? What are the elements of program failures as compared to the successes?

5. But the main frontier, implicit in the whole cooperative movement, is to invent new roles for old institutions. We should look to interinstitutional cooperation as a device for meeting major social problems. Individual colleges cannot effectively attack poverty or discrimination along, but in groups they might have a significant impact. In the social milieu the limits of the interinstitutional device can be tested most effectively.

I. SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE*

Introduction

Interinstitutional cooperation, as it is labeled, enjoys wide acceptance among college administrators as a device for overcoming mounting problems, and cooperative programs linking institutions of higher education are multiplying. In the face of its popularity it is remarkable how little is known about the movement. This assessment covers the available literature and points to frontiers for research and development that should receive support from foundations and from the public.

Although numerous discussions of interinstitutional cooperation exist, finding them is a problem. One's approach to Books in Print, periodical indexes, Dissertation Abstracts, government documents, and the New York Times must be highly imaginative, since interinstitutional main entries and cross references are undeveloped. More helpful

---

* The author would like to express his indebtedness to Mrs. Robert Nero and Miss Ruth Nielsen for their assistance in the preparation of this paper.

are uncited ephemera: brochures, proposals, conference reports, program evaluations, and letters. An appropriate classification system and a clearinghouse for current relevant materials on interinstitutional cooperation are badly needed, and the American Council on Education, the National Council of Churches, and the Committee on Institutional Cooperation of the Big Ten and the University of Chicago all have urged the establishment of such a service.

Valuable information can be abstracted from standard higher education reference works: the comprehensive professional source book, The College Blue Book, reissued every three years; Lovejoy's Guide, directed to the student's interest and updated annually; and the ACE's American Universities and Colleges, which comes out quadrennially.[1] State, regional, and nationally collected statistics are available,[2] and additional information can be gleaned from the more generalized reports of state governments and private foundations.

Although these works contain duplications, often give conflicting information, and are unstandardized as to nomenclature, they nonetheless provide significant longitudinal data on colleges participating in cooperative programs. If standardized and carefully analyzed, these continuing data would be of great value in helping to increase support for cooperative programs.

Information is also generated by the roughly 90 departments, centers, or sets of courses on higher education, such as the ones at Teachers College of Columbia University, New York University, Ohio State University, Southern Illinois University, the University of California at Berkeley, Florida State University, and the University of Michigan. But these centers, as Arthur J. Dibden has pointed out, need strengthening and should have an interdisciplinary framework. Faculty and students need to be drawn from areas other than schools of education; curriculum and research should be more concerned with the context of higher education and less with internal administrative matters.[3] These improvements could be promoted by additional support made available on the pattern and in the magnitude now set up for the U.S. Office of Education's Research and Demonstration Centers.

For better perspectives on interinstitutional cooperation, it is necessary to examine works outside the field of education per se. Works which open new vistas are David Riesman's assessment of institutional attitudes and behavior; Robert J. Havighurst's analysis of four-year colleges as shaped by the forces of economy, demography, and ideology; and Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson's construct of radical-liberal and conservative-reactionary models for two-year institutions.[4] Other valuable works are Talcott Parson's analytical tools for viewing education as a social system, and André Daniére's

projections of higher education as a major consumer and producer.[5] This reference to works with a social science orientation clearly underscores just how productive a broader perspective would be. We also need to delve into the utopian literature for perspective: the critical issue is to reconcile the "ideology of the university" with the organizational and administrative forms and patterns that higher education seems destined to take. For example, the "ideology" embraces the personalized student-faculty relationship, the development and worth of the individual, and the activation of social concern and involvement; yet our institutions increasingly become more massive, depersonalized, fragmented, and obscure in purpose.[6]

While the descriptive literature on interinstitutional cooperation is extensive, assessments of programs are few. Portrayals of successes, apparently prepared to please funding agencies, predominate. Little is recorded on interaction between colleges, its duration, intensity, or significance. Even less is known about the response of participating faculty members, administrators, or students. There is almost nothing on the results for society achieved through cooperative effort.

The recorded literature, in short, permits only a sketchy overview of interinstitutional cooperation. Of one thing, however, we can be sure--higher education has become a major American industry, and as in big business, its executives are talking about combinations to achieve

greater efficiency and economy. "What captivates the educational world now," Eldon Johnson has said, ". . . is this essential new possibility. It lies between isolated independence and complete merger. It is a vehicle to cope with problems readily perceived as common . . . ."[7]

Historical Background of Interinstitutional Cooperation

Cooperation among colleges is not new. It predates the Oxford-Cambridge arrangements; the University of Sankori at Timbuktu exchanged professors with Moorish University as early as A.D. 600.[8] In the United States, Cornell University entered a cooperative enterprise in 1894 through contractual arrangements with New York State. By 1904 the relationship was a mutual investment and symbiotic in nature.[9] Elsewhere over the same period such major contiguous institutions as Harvard and M.I.T. cooperated by informally agreeing to pursue quite separate academic emphases.

Major interest in promoting institutional cooperation among existing colleges began around World War I as a result of John D. Rockefeller's support of the General Education Board's work in higher education for Negroes. Consolidations were projected as a way to achieve economies. The board unsuccessfully attempted to bring Fisk University and Meharry Medical College together, but it did succeed in reorganizing Straight University, New Orleans University, and Flint-Goodridge Hospital as

Dillard University. Initial cooperation between Spelman College and Morehouse College in 1921 came to fruition in 1929 when John Hope, then president of Morehouse, accepted the presidency of a newly created Atlanta University. The Ponoma College cluster system was initiated by president James A. Bliesdell in 1923 as a direct reproduction of the Oxford pattern. In the early thirties cooperative acquisition of library holdings was begun between the University of North Carolina and Duke; at the same time Bryn Mawr, Haverford, and Swarthmore initiated some interdependent activities. In the Nashville area Vanderbilt University, George Peabody College, and Scarritt College had unified their libraries by the late thirties. The University Center in Georgia was founded in 1940 as an effort to bring together faculty members in what are now eight institutions, and in 1945 Radcliffe students began to get the bulk of their instruction in the same classes with Harvard men.[10]

For the period since World War II, Algo Henderson has documented cycles of collaboration: first, cooperation to accommodate returning veterans, then competition when the bulge of students slimmed, and finally renewed cooperation as enrollments surged again.[11] Some of the highlights of this period are well known. The University Center in Virginia was founded in 1946, and the Manhattan District--a cooperative program which developed the atomic bomb--in the same year spawned Argonne National Laboratory cooperative programs. The Hill Family

Foundation established a cooperative program for Hamline, Macalester, St. Thomas, and St. Catherine Colleges in Minnesota in 1953. The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges was a coalition of colleges passed over by the Ford Foundation in its distribution of $260 million to 630 institutions in 1955.[12]

The Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) was formed in 1954, inspiring formation of a similar group, the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education (WICHE). As a countermove to prevent a compulsory regional compact for the midwestern states, the Committee for Institutional Cooperation of the Big Ten and the University of Chicago (CIC) was begun in 1957 with a major grant from the Cornegie Foundation.[13]

Cooperative involvement by urban institutions in community problems was a theme of the Louisville meeting of the Association of Urban Universities in 1962, and that year a cooperative organization of colleges and universities in the Kansas City area (the Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education) was also formed. Stephens College, long interested in new teaching media, in 1963 obtained support from the Fund for the Advancement of Education to develop a telephone hook-up for transmitting lectures to a network of small liberal arts colleges.

Renewed interest in the predominantly Negro colleges came in 1962 when the Class "A" accreditation of these institutions was discarded,

and all were required to seek regular regional accreditation. Meetings held in Atlanta under Danforth Foundation sponsorship produced pleas for cooperative higher education efforts to support the education of Negroes in Prince Edward County where public schools had been abolished by local authorities seeking to avoid integration. As an outcome of these meetings and in the spirit of the civil rights movement, the cooperative movement was extended to the predominantly Negro colleges. In mid-1963 President Kennedy called a White House conference of educators and foundation personnel to seek their help in providing answers to the deepening racial crisis in America. The March on Washington was at hand and President Kennedy's advisers, particularly Jerrold Zacharias and Hobart Taylor, Jr., were urging expanded cooperation between northern universities and predominantly Negro colleges in the South. By 1964 several such arrangements were underway.

Cooperative patterns among church-related institutions, both Catholic and Protestant, have also increased, stimulated by the pressures of increased costs and the liberalizing effect of the ecumenical movement. Interinstitutional cooperation among Roman Catholic colleges had taken place on a small scale in bilateral relationships for some time, but in 1952, as a result of a National Catholic Education Association meeting, the Sister Formation Conference was created and cooperation followed at a greatly accelerated pace. A study just published by the National

Catholic Education Association shows that about one-third of the nation's 314 Catholic colleges are now involved in cooperative programs. Some two-thirds of these programs did not exist in 1960,[14] and many links have been forged with non-Catholic institutions.

Cooperation among Protestant colleges has shown a similar growth. Many of the 800 church-related colleges have been experimenting with a variety of combinations. Some have ties with non-religious associations, others are in new groupings as a result of initiatives taken by their own church boards. The Northwest Iowa College Association, a newly formed group, cuts across denominations in creating relationships between five institutions in that state. J. Lynn Leavenworth, director of the American Baptist Board of Education, said recently: "Ironically, it is likely to be practical consideration rather than devotion to ecumenism that dictates the future of our theological seminaries . . . <u>now it is consolidate or else</u>! Within ten years even some of the most determined and proud of our seminaries will be driven to seek cooperative relationships in order to survive . . . ."[15] During the past year the National Council of Churches through its Commission on Higher Education has spearheaded cooperative efforts between geographically proximal member colleges.

The most recent stimulus for cooperation has come from the Higher Education Act of 1965. Eighty-four cooperative programs between

"developing" and "established" institutions in higher education were funded to begin operation in September 1966.

In retrospect the idea of achieving strength and quality through cooperation has been promoted in almost every segment of higher education and with an ever mounting fervor.

The Semantics of Cooperation

Interinstitutional cooperation goes under many names, the most common being center, consortium or council, cooperative and exchange program, and association. This nomenclature roughly covers a continuum: at one end are those groups which are tightly knit with an administrative emphasis, and at the other are those with looser, more occasional ties in which faculty members and students are the prominent participants.

In a center the administrators of member institutions work in a common agency that coordinates activities and initiates new programs.[16] "A cooperative dynamic is developed," as Herbert F. K. Fitzroy has put it, "in which one cooperative program suggests another, until the administrators and faculty members of the affiliated institutions find themselves to a surprising degree thinking cooperatively."[17] These centers often have directors whose role approaches that of a president of a university system. Perhaps the outstanding example of this kind of

extensive interaction is the Claremont Colleges. Also illustrative are the University Center of Virginia, the Atlanta University Center, and the Piedmont University Center.

Consortia or councils tend to be federative arrangements for planning and coordination in specific areas. The linking agency is usually overshadowed by institutional members. The Joint Graduate Consortium in Washington, D.C., the Michigan Council of State College Presidents, and the Council of Higher Educational Institutions in New York City exemplify this pattern.

Cooperative and exchange programs appear as incidental ties, usually between institutions, for limited purposes--faculty or student exchange, joint use of facilities, or cooperative research. Examples of established bilateral relationships are Hampton Institute and Cornell University, Ursuline College and Bellarmine College, and the University of Wisconsin and North Carolina College.[18]

The term association usually refers to a group of loosely connected institutions organized on a regional or national basis. Official contact is often primarily at the level of the chief executive officer for project-by-project coordination. It is in the projects which bring individual students and faculty members together, and not in the interaction of institutions, that the reality of the associative structure exists. Problems

sometimes arise in such associations because of inadequate machinery for decision making, limited independent resources, and underdeveloped communication arrangements. The Associated Colleges of the Midwest, Great Lakes College Association, and the Central States Colleges Association are typical associations.[19]

Other terms are also used--committee, program, group, inter-university, institute, union--but these labels, even more than those above, are a search for the novel title and are not descriptive of the cooperative relationship. Combinations can also be seen as bilateral and multilateral, geographically proximal and distal, voluntary and compulsory, single purpose and multifunctional. The mainstream of higher education today is a network of cooperative relationships, and the larger the institution the more elaborate the fabric of cooperation. The University of Wisconsin, for example, reports 40 cooperative arrangements.[20]

The basic unit in cooperative programs is the college. Here, too, there is confusion: the term college applies to a wide range of institutions which share only limited characteristics. Accrediting agencies set a lower-end-range definition for "college." While this test is widely used, critics such as William K. Selden point to the difficulties inherent in allowing the established colleges to determine who will be allowed on the lower rungs of the higher education ladder. Not only are

there no uniform standards, but accreditation criteria are often irrelevant and outdated.[21]

The Developing Colleges Program under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 has accepted accreditation as a criterion, but it has also extended eligibility to institutions submitting letters from accrediting agencies stating they are making "reasonable progress" toward achieving accreditation. Difficulties have nonetheless arisen because the problem-solving objectives of the Higher Education Act differ from the academic criteria applied in the accreditation procedures.

Other institutions, with far above minimal credentials, are excluded from the college category because their educational activities are seen mainly as byproducts of business or manufacturing. Programs at Raytheon, Xerox, and Polaroid Corporations are examples. Also traditionally glossed over are the cooperative educational programs between colleges and business, though they differ little from such usually cited programs as the Argonne Laboratories, the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies, or colleges cooperation under the TVA or NASA.[22] Appropriate definitions of a college need to turn less on statements of institutional mission and more on the educational results for students and society. In the future, business, industrial, and governmental units will carry on expanded educational programs which may well affect society to a greater extent than does "college."

The use of the word cooperation also presents significant omissions and contradictions. In the professional journals interinstitutional cooperation usually means voluntary relationships, as distinct from legally mandated arrangements. But the potential importance of these latter relationships is great. State legislatures have authorized coordinating councils and boards, most often with advisory powers, in 41 states.[23] While such combinations are excluded from this discussion, the rapid spread of this device underlines the importance of some form of compulsion in interinstitutional coordination. Indeed, most so-called voluntary arrangements, though without legal mandate, do operate within the rather considerable bounds set by foundations and government grants.

Commentators on cooperative arrangements usually omit multicampus relationships between major state universities and their subordinate units, such as exist in the Missouri, Wisconsin, and North Carolina systems. Similarly omitted (though extensively reported in the literature) are the large number of established links between two-year institutions and four-year colleges, and between baccalaureate programs and graduate and professional schools (the common 3-2 arrangement). These are, however, bona fide instances of interinstitutional cooperation and may be, in fact, precisely the kind of articulation with the greatest promise for a better allocation of our limited educational resources.

The exclusion of so many relationships from discussions of institutional cooperation only further emphasizes how widespread the pattern of combinations has become. In sum, the literature reflects a groping. We do not yet know how to label programs mainly because so little is known about what is taking place.

Mounting Pressures for Cooperation

Internal and external pressures interacting with the promise of new opportunities have promoted a great variety of cooperative patterns. Concern about multiplying enrollments, rising costs, the explosion of knowledge, and ways to use the new media--in recent writings by Logan Wilson, Francis Keppel, Seymour Harris, Frederick Bolman, and James Doi--almost invariably point to interinstitutional cooperation as a major ameliorative device.[24]

The quest for quality, particularly for "developing" colleges, also promotes cooperation. Whether criteria for quality are the student-related ones of Winslow Hatch, a yardstick for institutions as described by Samuel Baskin, dimensions of democratization as projected by John Brubacher, or a variable of size as seen by Richard O. Poorman, it is agreed that colleges cannot promote quality in isolation from one another.[25]

Pressure to expand graduate education facilities has presented a

continuing reason for cooperation. The Southern Regional Education Board began with this primary motivation, and the newer state coordinating boards invariably give high priority to college cooperation in graduate instruction, often because of the heavy costs involved. The New England Board of Higher Education now plans to coordinate Ph.D. programs among its six state universities; similar tendencies are apparent in the University of Michigan's special cooperative program with small colleges near Ann Arbor.[26] The University of Minnesota has recently announced a program with neighboring liberal arts colleges which will aid these small institutions in holding their faculties by permitting their professors to do some teaching and research in graduate departments at the state's major university. Temple University's program with five liberal arts colleges in southeast Pennsylvania, and the Duke University-University of North Carolina Marine Biology Laboratory are other examples.[27]

Perhaps the most noteworthy instances of cooperation in which universities are taking the lead are the newly created industrial research parks in Lafayette, Ind.; Cambridge, Mass.; and Durham, N.C.[28] It is the research and consulting opportunities that these parks afford which bring higher education and business to the service of each other.

Scarce instructional resources for non-Western programs,

particularly in connection with language studies, further illustrate the pressures to combine.[29] Examples are programs at Antioch and Earlham, Western College for Women and Miami University, the Gettysburg Group, the St. Paul Group, Wake Forest College and Winston-Salem State College, the Capital District Group in Albany, N.Y., and members of the Associated Colleges of the Midwest. The Russian language program in Worcester, Mass., the Italian language and literature group centered in Chicago, and the critical languages program at Princeton are other notable examples.

Similarly, the practice of using facilities jointly is expanding. The sharing of library resources, perhaps the oldest kind of combination, is done frequently.[30] The Computer Center in the Research Triangle Area in North Carolina links North Carolina State University at Raleigh, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and Duke University at Durham; the University of Texas, Huston-Tillotson College, and St. Edwards University are connected by microwave in the Texas Educational Microwave Project; and similar networks exist in the Midwest Program on Airborne Television Instruction and the West Central Florida College TV network. Harvard and Yale have come together with nearly a dozen other institutions as part of the Lowell Institute Cooperating Broadcasting Radio and Television network.

Encouragement for interinstitutional cooperation has also come from

many points outside of the campus. Programs conducted by several agencies of the Federal Government push colleges together. The National Science Foundation has assisted such cooperative undertakings as the oceanographic program at Duke University, the Joint Computer program in North Carolina, and the Marine Science Research Center at Santa Catalina Island. The Tennessee Valley Authority was partial sponsor of the Council on Cooperative College Projects which services a wide range of institutions including predominantly Negro colleges in Kentucky, Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and Texas. Numerous projects have involved the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Institutes of Health, and the National Science Foundation. The necessities of diplomacy and defense forge links, many of which--as Ramparts magazine has recently uncovered--are tangentially education at best, and most such programs are classified.[31]

Under Title II of the National Defense Education Act, the U.S. Office of Education established an Education Communications System to study the possibilities of electronic interconnection between colleges and universities. The USOE has also contracted to finance the Harvard Center for Educational Research, which involves 12 agencies and school systems. Under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, the USOE invested $5 million in cooperative programs in 1965-66 and an expected

$30 million in 1966-67. The Elementary and Secondary Act encourages cooperation under its provisions for supplementary educational centers, research and development, and regional educational laboratories. This legislation indicates an increasingly important role for government agencies in sponsoring cooperative relationships.

Even more significant forces may be promoting interinstitutional cooperation at the state level. Prominent are the programs under interstate compact regional boards. Through serving as exchange points for information and as data-collecting agencies, these boards promote cooperation among colleges almost as their primary function. Kroepsch and Kaplan, in Logan Wilson's Emerging Patterns, have given a detailed analysis of the function of regional boards.[32] Under NEBHE, for example, the six state university libraries in New England will develop centralized processing and cataloging.[33] NEBHE also reports support from the New England Governors' Council to permit community colleges along the border of one state to be used by students from beyond that state line without the payment of out-of-state tuition and with both states contributing to the development of the facility.

States encourage cooperation because of their growing financial commitment to higher education. One practical impetus has been the need to reduce budgetary competition among systems of higher

education--teacher-training institutions, land-grant schools, urban universities, community colleges, and technical institutes--emerging within the same state. In the absence of systematic cooperation, state legislatures in effect are forced to become supra-boards of trustees. The necessity to formulate "state plans" responsive to all segments of higher education under the Higher Education Facilities Act has also prompted cooperation at the state level. Perhaps the most dramatic state-based activity is the Compact for Education, which by midsummer of 1966 had 33 states and 3 territories in its membership.[34]

Cooperation at the state level will certainly expand. The New York State Education Department is now actively encouraging interinstitutional cooperation. Indiana has evolved an effective working relationship in financial matters between public and private institutions in the state. The administration of the Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1963 requires a statewide school-college planning board. Just how far partnership between the state and its private, particularly parochial, institutions may go will depend on the outcome of appeals made from the decision of the Maryland Supreme Court, which in 1966 ruled that certain state contributions to sectarian higher institutions were unconstitutional.[35]

Since 1960 the cooperative movement has surged ahead, in large

part because of the associations themselves which continually expand memberships and extend their range of activities. The idea that it is desirable to have an association seems to have become in itself a motivating factor as many new groups have emerged. Several associations have been identified with an arbitrary geographical base (for example, Missouri Valley Colleges Association, Associated Rocky Mountain Universities, and Central States College Association), while more geographically circumscribed are the Harrisburg Area Center for Higher Education and the Higher Education Coordinating Council for St. Louis. So extensive is this urge to combine that there is now a move to establish an Association of Associations.

Possibilities for expanded research have often prompted cooperation. Much of the activity under CIC is in cooperative research; the New York City Center for Research and Development is a similar relationship, with a public education focus. Subjects also have stimulated cooperation: work in astronomy prompts college cooperation in Arizona; political research brings many universities to Ann Arbor; gerontology links the University of Michigan and Wayne State University. A new group, University Research Associates Inc., has been formed to bid on a proposed 200 BEV accelerator to be established under the Atomic Energy Commission.

Finally the private philanthropic and business-related foundations have been a major stimulating force. It is not always clear whether foundations provide the initiative or whether colleges propose an effort and then search out financial support; what is clear, however, is that behind most cooperative ventures a foundation is usually to be found. The Hill Foundation played a major role in the grouping of colleges in the Twin City area of Minnesota; the Kettering Foundation and Western Electric have been particularly active in the field of engineering; the Danforth Foundation works among the predominantly Negro colleges; the Kellogg Foundation in activities in the communication media and continuing education; the Russell Sage Foundation in groupings for Far Eastern studies; and the Rockefeller Foundation in aiding "disadvantaged students" and expanding teaching resources. The Carnegie Corporation and the Ford Foundation are involved in a great variety of cooperative relationships at all stages of development. This is, of course, a most incomplete list.

As these facts indicate, interinstitutional cooperation extends beyond such well-known regional groupings as the Southern Regional Education Board, the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, or the New England Board of Higher Education, and it far exceeds the highly publicized programs linking larger northern universities with predominantly Negro colleges in the South. More than a hundred

associations and a thousand cooperative relationships are reported in the literature. Raymond Moore of the U.S. Office of Education has identified 900 relationships involving graduate instruction alone.[36]

Pressures for cooperation have come steadily but in an uncoordinated fashion: government at all levels is involved, many private foundations have a major interest, and the colleges themselves are encouraging such efforts. The result is a maze of organizations with confusing labels. In short, there is a wealth of information which cries out for analysis.

II. ANALYSIS

The Problem of Understanding What Is Happening

Simply understanding the growth and operation of large institutions, let alone influencing their development, is difficult. Beyond the systematic assembling of data there must be ways to gain insights. To date, processes of interinstitutional relations have remained largely immune from scholarship. The absence of theory is central to the problem. Without a set of facts to relate to each other no principles emerge, comparative studies cannot be mounted, and no systematic knowledge is assembled.

The truly interesting questions remain beyond our grasp. What are the distortions of perception that are encouraging the combination movement? Are students and faculty members being affected in a productive way? What are the issues posed by the new arrangements? What are the elements common to successful cooperation? Can we expect a clash of elites in this institutional transformation? Will needed educational innovations come? Could a reallocation of resources result?

Effective analysis will require purposeful taxonomy. Little more than a beginning are the categorizations of Ertell, Anderson, Donovan, Koenker, and Martorana which organize programs by: (1) the number of participating units (bilateral, multilateral, constellational); (2) the distance separating institutions (metropolitan, statewide, regional, interregional, or national); (3) participating clientele (church-related, small colleges, Roman Catholic institutions, or predominantly Negro colleges); (4) the nature of the activity (instructional, research, administrative, or service); (5) the level of instruction (precollege, undergraduate, graduate, or continuing education); or (6) the legal basis of the agreement.[37] Still to be distinguished are developmental programs from incidental projects, the short-run endeavor from programs of interdependence, student or faculty initiated efforts from those that are administratively mandated. As Herbert W. K. Fitzroy has put it, we need to sort out the "interinstitutional cooperatives [which] involve practices and relationships which go directly to the heart of the educational responsibilities of the college."[38]

A lack of comparative studies prevents even the rough measurement of the relative effectiveness of college-to-college cooperation in raising quality or in meeting various pressures. For cooperative programs involving developing colleges, little analysis exists as to how the combination responds to institutional needs and priorities for both partners

in the exchange relationship. We should know, for example, how interstitutional cooperation as an amelioratory device compares with projects sponsored by major associations within disciplines, by accrediting agencies, or by management consultant firms.[39]

A theoretical framework would throw light on the quid pro quo elements implicit in cooperation. Rejection of the "big brother" attitude in bilateral relationships has been described and detailed by Beatrice R. Buszek.[40] Not so well documented is the reverse, an exploration of what a developing college can bring to an established college--yet the developing college's program may depend on this knowledge.

Interinstitutional cooperation should be seen as a process. The origins of programs have not yet been told, especially the role played in the cooperative movement as a whole by the major foundations, the President's Science Advisory Board, the American Council on Education, Educational Services Inc., and the U.S. Office of Education--to mention only a few of the prominent initiators.[41] When documented, the factors which prompted major universities in the Midwest to take the initiative in this effort may well go beyond their announced objectives of promoting efficiency and economy. The differential role of students, faculty members, and administrators in sustaining projects once they are started also needs to be set forth. We know too little

of what has prompted development, revision, and discontinuation of programs. Rather than providing answers, for example, the announcement that a foundation grant has not been extended merely raises questions.

With almost no model building, simulation theory, or cyclical analysis it is not surprising that many basic questions remain unanswered. How does the goal of upgrading quality relate to the objectives of more community service and extended aid to less developed colleges? How does the movement for cooperation square with traditional regard for institutional autonomy? How does government-sponsored cooperation confirm or deny traditional fears of government control? What will be the educational consequences of increased college interdependence with business and industry?

To answer such questions a more adequate theoretical foundation will be required. Scholars will have to take into account external pressures along with internal factors. The ecology of cooperation has--at least--demographic, economic, and ideological dimensions. A range of specific pressures from legislatures, governing boards, elected officials, opinion molders, and historic precedent--as well as the traditional educational concerns--will have to be assessed. Thus far the literature on interinstitutional cooperation, like the literature on

higher education in general, has only pointed to the important matters that need to be explored.

Alternatives and Innovations: The Search for Clarity

The preceding sections contain some suggested areas in which research and development are needed in order to accumulate a systematic body of theory, to deepen our understanding of the dynamics of interinstitutional cooperation, and to see it within its historical context. The beginnings of such concerns have arisen from the movement to dispense with the pragmatic and idyllic concepts based on 18th-century thought. Recognizing the aspects of contemporary higher education involving the balance of power and executively oriented big business, educators have begun to make use of Galbraithean theory, infrastructure models, and systems analysis technique.[42]

Commentators on higher education have pointed to areas where research can proceed. Eldon Johnson suggests that we probe the origins of existing cooperative programs and project the limits of the cooperative device.[43] M. M. Chambers urges study of the increasing conflict between the heretofore private world of higher education and state coordinating boards which thrust colleges and universities deep into state politics.[44] Owen A. Knorr asks why, in the face of so much discussion, so few students and professors are directly affected; he suggests that an adequate explanation will point up the staunch

individualism of chief executive officers. Such probing may also document major restraints on cooperation exercised by university faculties in the individual disciplines.

According to John J. Hicks, the accumulation of knowledge on how cooperative programs actually work will convince the higher education community that interinstitutional cooperation is worth the additional investment.[45] Irwin K. French of the New York State Education Department has suggested that new programs might be tried in such nonacademic areas as food services and buildings and grounds. Fred E. Crossland asks for more use of the cooperative device in recruiting college students, citing the British experience as a model.[46] Winslow Hatch has urged that cooperation be stimulated through the academic disciplines, in the hope that such relationships would be more functional and have promise of a longer duration.

Program evaluators suggest the accumulation of information on the administration of existing cooperatives. John Blue of the U.S. Office of Education has pointed out the need to assess the real costs, including illusive overhead; Stanley F. Salwak has projected a "determinance of usefulness" for measuring programs; and Eldon Johnson has offered a guide that might be used for determining how much cooperation has taken place.[47] The Princeton Conference in 1962 and the Morehouse Conference in 1965 both detailed large and small matters to be asked

about cooperation: e.g., the permanence of academic gains, long-distance versus short-distance exchanges, and a range of pressures (of size, of institutional economy, of growing material rather than human concerns, of weakened decision making and undermined management skills).[48]

As a counterbalance to the present emphasis in the literature on the chief executive officer's point of view, more clarity may come through descriptive monographs assessing the experience of participants in cooperative arrangements. Such empirical studies should include recorded experience which goes beyond data obtained from mailed questionnaires. Such studies would also reduce the emphasis on goals of economy and would provide new thinking on how the cooperative device improves quality in the higher educational enterprise. The literature about current cooperative programs could be made more valuable if directors of existing associations would detail the pressures and constraints under which they operate and would outline the special opportunities that the combination device presents for overcoming resistance to change in higher education.

Especially important would be new studies that focus upon special problems, such as the utility of the cooperative device in the small liberal arts college's struggle to survive.

Other educators have suggested that support be given to exploring the extension of the cooperative device into underdeveloped areas of higher education. James Crow of the University of Wisconsin, following an exchange experience at Morehouse College, urged broader use of cooperative arrangements as a way to improve communication with prospective graduate students from institutions not presently well represented in graduate education. Philip G. Hubbard, academic affairs dean at the University of Iowa, saw the exchange programs as one way of permitting a developing institution to gain some distinction through specialization. The National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges has urged colleges to come together to promote off-campus instruction for those who desire higher education but who are unable to come to the campus. The Carnegie Corporation has advanced the idea that interinstitutional cooperation might help in producing more leaders, and the CIC has said its cooperative arrangement should be used for cooperative curriculum studies at the university level. Optimal institutional size and the hazards presented by overzealous, combination-minded state universities are questioned by Raymond G. Gibson.[49] And Martin Lichterman has expressed concern about the expansive inroads by business into higher education, often under the label of cooperation.

In these areas and others authors have seen a major role for the

USOE and for private foundations in providing seed grants, initiating pilot projects, and underwriting the needed research. Clearly projects of this sort would add to our knowledge of the interinstitutional movement.

The Frontier: New Roles for Old Institutions

We can clarify the functions of interinstitutional cooperation and produce insights into it. But will we go beyond informational objectives? Should not the interinstitutional device, once it is known, lead to restructuring for higher education and redirection toward greater public responsibility? New organizational devices allow for possibilities heretofore frustrated by the traditionally organized university. The main frontier, implicit in the whole cooperative movement, is in the invention of new roles for old institutions.

It is in the acceptance of increased social responsibilities that these new roles emerge. Colleges must do more than cooperate if they are to do better what they have traditionally done fairly well--produce technicians and provide research for the highest bidder. Twentieth-century America is scarred by continuing wars, decaying cities, pockets of poverty, technological tyrannies, community disillusionment, and a threatening nuclear holocaust. Higher education must face these issues; it can no longer pursue traditional goals, for it too struggles in

the same web. Its resources must be marshalled to effect an escape.

Funding procedures must also change. In the past the professor went to government, business, foundations, or to the military in search of funds. Money was parceled out year by year for projects meeting the objectives of funding groups. Projects proliferated, teaching talent was siphoned off, and research accumulated that was unused. Deep pastoral roots in higher education nurtured aloofness from the social struggle. Isolated, colleges failed to change adequately even themselves, their curriculum or teaching methods, the composition of faculties and students, the manner of their extension or service mission. When the institution is uninvolved, much that it does is irrelevant. Students articulate this alienation: a university uncommitted to forging ethical social goals in itself, its community, and in the world has in fact already become aligned with reaction.

The cooperative device is needed to reach beyond the individual professor and project, or even the individual institution, to focus larger aggregates of higher education on a higher order of commitment. Cooperation can mean the alignment of higher education away from enchantments with economies of various sorts and toward leadership in promoting change. Whole institutions can link themselves for leverage to encourage community development, to overcome racial antipathies, or to promote a supranational loyalty.

Committing combinations of colleges to probe perplexing social problems would test the limits of the interinstitutional device and give it life. How far can cooperation go to reduce the gap between advanced and developing colleges? Can such associating push beyond desegregation in higher education and toward true integration? Will college consortia mean commitment to cities? Can university centers produce a passion for universals to redress the narrowness of nationalisms?

The agenda of problems is long but it essentially involves commitment to basic reforms. Higher education could make a difference. Foundations and government should give support priorities to that interinstitutional cooperation which seeks to transform the community of scholars into scholars at work building community at home and abroad. No greater rejuvenation could be given to higher education than direction toward tasks that must be done.

FOOTNOTES

1. Christian E. Burckel, ed., The College Blue Book. 9th, 10th, 11th editions. New York, C. E. Burckel, 1959, 1962, 1965. Clarence E. Lovejoy, Lovejoy's College Guide. New York, Simon and Schuster, 1966. Allan M. Cartter, ed., American Universities and Colleges. 8th, 9th editions. Washington, American Council on Education, 1960, 1964. James Cass and Max Birnbaum, Comparative Guide to American Colleges for Students, Parents, and Counselors. New York, Harper & Row, 1964.

2. Digest of Educational Statistics. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1963, 1965. W. E. Armstrong, "Regional and Professional Accreditation." Liberal Education, vol. 48, No. 2, p. 234-42. May, 1962. Earned Degrees Conferred. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1961-66. Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, Pt. 1, "Institutional Data." Washington, Government Printing Office, 1959-64. Statistics of Non-public Secondary Schools. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1963. Statistics of State School Systems. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1961.

3. Arthur J. Dibden, "A Department of Higher Education: Problems and Prospects." Educational Record, vol. 46, p. 209-16. Summer, 1965.

4. David Riesman, "Alteration in Institutional Attitude and Behavior." In Logan Wilson, ed., Emerging Patterns in Higher Education, p. 66-74. Washington, American Council on Education, 1965. Robert J. Havighurst, American Higher Education in the 1960's. Columbus, Ohio State University Press, 1960. Clyde E. Blocker, Robert H. Plummer, and Richard C. Richardson, Jr., The Two Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1965.

5. Talcott Parsons, "School Class as a Social System: Some of Its Functions in American Society." Harvard Educational Review, vol. 29,

No. 4, p. 297-318. Fall 1959. André Danière, Higher Education in the American Economy. New York, Random House, 1964. See also Burton D. Friedman, Higher Education in the United States Perceived as a Social System. Dissertation. Michigan State University, 1961. Nevitt Sanford, ed., The American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation of Higher Learning. New York, John Wiley, 1962.

6. The author is indebted for this thought to Frampton Davis, a student of James Doi at the University of Michigan.

7. Eldon L. Johnson, "College Federations." Journal of Higher Education, vol. 35, No. 1, p. 1. January, 1966. Until recently Johnson was president of the Great Lakes College Association.

8. Lerone Bennett, Jr., "The African Past." Ebony, vol. 16, p. 34-40. July, 1961.

9. Malcolm Carron, The Contract Colleges at Cornell University. Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell University Press, 1958.

10. Merle Curti and Richard Nash, Philanthropy in the Shaping of American Education, p. 177-78. New Brunswick, N.J., Rutgers University Press, 1965. David Boroff, Campus U.S.A. New York, Harper and Bros., 1961. Merton W. Ertell, Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education, p. 5, 53. Albany, N.Y., University of the State of New York, 1957. Also pamphlets from the Atlanta University Center.

11. Algo D. Henderson, "The CCC of College Relations." Educational Record, vol. 43, No. 1, p. 48-56. April, 1962.

12. Alfred T. Hill, "Cooperation Among Small Colleges." In George F. Donovan, ed., College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation, p. 34-46. Washington, Catholic University of America Press, 1965.

13. Stanley F. Salwak, "The Need for Cooperation and the CIC Response." Educational Record, vol. 45, No. 3, p. 308-16. Summer 1964.

14. Sister M. Dolores Salerno, "Patterns of Interinstitutional Cooperation in American Catholic Higher Education." National Catholic Educational Association Bulletin, vol. 62, No. 4, p. 4. May, 1966.

15. J. L. Leavenworth, "Towards Seminary Merger: Possible Forms of Cooperation." Christian Century, vol. 43, p. 527. April 27, 1966.

16. John J. Wittich, "The College Center Movement." College and University Journal, vol. 1, p. 31-34. Summer 1962.

17. Herbert W. K. Fitzroy, Interinstitutional Cooperation: Hopes and Reality, p. 12. Richmond, University Center in Virginia, 1962. Address delivered to the Conference on College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation, Princeton, N.J., April 13, 1962.

18. For an example of a cooperative and exchange program, see Hampton Institute, "Possible Cooperative Relationships Between Hampton Institute and Major Universities." 18th Annual Educational Staff Institute, September 14-15, 1964.

19. Eldon Johnson has suggested that the Great Lakes College Association aims to move in the direction of the Claremont College pattern.

20. All of the top-ranking institutions in Allan Cartter's recent study of graduate education have multiple cooperative arrangements. These include University of California at Berkeley, Harvard, Illinois, Wisconsin, Princeton, Michigan, Chicago, M.I.T., California Institute of Technology, Stanford, and Yale.

21. William K. Selden, "The Relative Unimportance of Regional Accreditation." Journal of Teacher Education, vol. 13, p. 319-25. September, 1966.

22. Earl H. Pierro, ed., Change and Opportunity in the Tennessee Valley States. Fort Valley, Ga., Council on Cooperative College Projects, 1964. Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies, Inc., 19th Annual Report. N.p., June 30, 1965.

23. M. M. Chambers, Chance and Choice in Higher Education. Bloomington, Ind., Bloomcraft Press, 1962. Chambers, Freedom and Repression in Higher Education. Bloomington, Ind., Bloomcraft Press, 1965. Also letters and data from the state coordinating agencies in Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, Ohio, Texas, Utah, and Virginia.

24. Wilson, ed., op. cit. Francis Keppel, The Necessary Revolution in American Education. New York, Harper & Row, 1966. Seymour Harris and Alan Levensohn, eds., Education and Public Policy. Berkeley, McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1965. Seymour Harris, Kenneth M. Deitch, and Alan Levensohn, eds., Challenge and Change in American

Education. Berkeley, McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1965. Frederick Bolman, "Needed Research in Administration of Higher Education." Educational Record, vol. 46, No. 2, p. 166-76. Spring 1965. James Doi, "Pressures to Increase Educational Productivity in Institutions." In Current Issues in Higher Education, p. 112-14. Washington, Association on Higher Education, 1965. See also Robert C. Anderson, Stanley J. Wenberg, and Wendel P. Jones, "What Are the Current Potential Implications of Regional Cooperation Among Institutions of Higher Education for Improving and Extending Educational Opportunities?" In Current Issues in Higher Education, p. 142-52. Washington, Association for Higher Education, 1958; Ruth E. Eckert, "Patterns of Interinstitutional Cooperation." In Current Issues in Higher Education, p. 96-102. Washington, Association for Higher Education, 1953; T. C. Holy, "What Contributions Can Voluntary State and Regional Cooperative Planning Make Toward Meeting Increased Enrollments?" In Current Issues in Higher Education, p. 244-50. Washington, Association for Higher Education, 1955; and James C. Messersmith, "Ideas and Patterns for Future Programs of Interinstitutional Cooperation." In Current Issues in Higher Education, p. 150-53. Washington, Association for Higher Education, 1962.

25. Winslow R. Hatch, What Standards Do We Raise? Washington, Government Printing Office, 1960. (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, New Dimensions in Higher Education, No. 12.). Samuel Baskin, Quest for Quality. Ibid., No. 7; John S. Brubacher, Bases for Policy in Higher Education. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1965. Richard O. Poorman, "The Small College: A Second Look," Catholic Educational Review, vol. 63, No. 3, p. 145-56. March, 1965.

26. "Among the Colleges." Liberal Education, vol. 48, No. 6, p. 552. December, 1962.

27. Millard E. Gladfelter, Higher Education in the United States, p. 91-92. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1960. See also "Duke University Marine Laboratory 1965," a booklet prepared for the dedication of the biological research vessel Eastward.

28. "The Emphasis Is on Practicality." Industrial Development, p. 39-51. August, 1963.

29. Don Peretz, "Cooperative Faculty Seminar in Far Eastern Art and Culture." Liberal Education, vol. 51, No. 4, p. 497-503. December, 1965. Ward Morehouse, The International Dimensions of Education in New York State. Albany, N.Y., State Education Department, 1963.

Morehouse, "Strengthening the Study of Neglected Cultures." Journal of Higher Education, vol. 34, No. 6, p. 311-17. June 1963. The Challenge of a Revolutionary World: Progress Reports. Albany, N.Y., State Education Department, 1963, 1964, 1965. Association of American Colleges, Non-Western Studies in the Liberal Arts College. Washington, 1964.

30. Maurice F. Tauber, "Trends and Tangents--The Library." Journal of Higher Education, vol. 34, p. 170-71. March, 1963.

31. Adolfo Gilly, "The University on the Make." Ramparts, vol. 4, No. 12, p. 11-22. April, 1966.

32. Robert H. Kroepsch and M. Stephen Kaplan, "Interstate Cooperation and Coordination in Higher Education." In Wilson, ed., op. cit., p. 174-90.

33. This project is funded by the Council on Library Resources.

34. J. B. Conant, "How the Compact Can Assist the Universities." Educational Record, vol. 47, p. 99-105. Winter 1966.

35. The Horace Mann League of the United States v. The Board of Public Works of Maryland. 220 A 2nd 51 (1966).

36. This is a study of graduate consortia being conducted by the U.S. Office of Education. It is based upon a mailed questionnaire to a wide range of institutions of higher education. Findings were to be published in the fall of 1966.

37. Ertell, op. cit., see n. 10 above. Wayne W. Anderson, Cooperation Within American Higher Education. Washington, Association of American Colleges, 1964. George F. Donovan, "The Philosophy of Interinstitutional Cooperation in American Higher Education," p. 3-18. College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation, op. cit. Robert H. Koenker, Institutional Cooperation at the Graduate Level. Muncie, Ind., Ball State College, 1962.

38. Fitzroy, op. cit.

39. Some of the more prominent consulting firms are the Academy for Educational Development, Nelson Associates, A. T. Kearney and Company, and the Institute for Educational Planning, Inc.

40. Beatrice Ross Buszek, "Cornell University and Hampton Institute." Expanding Opportunities, vol. 2, No. 1, p. 6-11. January, 1965. "A Working Conference on Cooperative Programs Among Universities and Predominantly Negro Colleges." Typescript. Atlanta, Morehead College, August 20, 1965.

41. See, for example, Samuel Nabrit, Steven White, and Jerrold Zacharias, "Proposal for the Development of Predominantly Negro Colleges." Unpublished manuscript presented to the American Council on Education, October, 1962.

42. Alexander W. Astin, "Empirical Characterization of Higher Educational Institutions." Journal of Education Psychology, vol. 53, p. 224-35. October, 1962. U.S. Office of Education, Residence and Migration and the College Student. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1963. Gordon M. Ambach, "Regional Commission versus State Commission for Administration of Title I, Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963." Unpublished paper, Harvard University, 1965. Merton W. Ertell, "Toward a Philosophy of Interinstitutional Cooperation." Educational Record, vol. 39, No. 2, p. 131-39. April, 1958. Wilson, ed., see n. 4 above. Ralph J. Murray, "The Theory and Practice of Cooperation." College and University Journal, vol. 2, p. 31-34. Summer, 1963. Donovan, see n. 37 above; Eckert, see n. 24 above.

43. Eldon L. Johnson, "Cooperation in Higher Education." Liberal Education, vol. 48, No. 6, p. 475-78. December, 1962.

44. Chambers, Freedom and Repression in Higher Education, see n. 23 above.

45. John J. Hicks, "Promoting Institutional Cooperation by Small Dribbles of Money," In John J. Wittich, ed., College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation, p. 46, 49, and passim. Corning, N.Y., College Center of the Finger Lakes, 1962. Proceedings of a Conference on College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation, Princeton, N.J., 1962.

46. Fred E. Crossland, "Politics and Policies, the College Admissions." Phi Delta Kappan, vol. 46, No. 7, p. 299-302. March, 1965.

47. See "Working Conference," n. 40 above. See also Salwak, n. 13 above. Johnson, see n. 43 above.

48. Wittich, ed., see n. 45 above. See also "Working Conference," n. 40 above.

49. Raymond C. Gibson, The Challenge of Leadership in Higher Education, p. 7. Dubuque, Iowa, William C. Brown Co., 1964.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Pressures on Higher Education

1. Andrews, F. Emerson, ed., Foundations, 20 Viewpoints. New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1965. 108 p.

Since interinstitutional cooperation receives a great deal of support from foundations, this collection of essays provides helpful guides to higher educational administrators for their relations with foundation officers. Among the titles are "How Foundations Evaluate Requests," by Yorke Allen, Jr., of the Rockefeller Foundation; "Preparing the Foundation Proposal," by Manning M. Pattillo of the Danforth Foundation; and "What the New Foundation Executive Should Know," by President James A. Perkins of Cornell University.

2. Blocker, Clyde E., Robert H. Plummer, and Richard C. Richardson, Jr., The Two Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1965. 298 p.

An attempt to understand the evolution and problems of the two-year and community colleges. The authors position themselves outside of the atmosphere of protective fervor that accompanied the establishment of these colleges. They review present problems and needs of the colleges in the context of social pressures, and they define and contrast various positions on the educational continuum from reactionary to radical. Ways in which these various orientations combine with external pressures in shaping the two-year institution are discussed, and the authors take the position that the chief offerings of the junior college should be in technical-vocational and adult education.

3. Blueprint for Action by Universities for Achieving Integration in Education. Madison, Wis., Institute of Human Relations, University of Wisconsin, 1964.

A report of the third conference of Big Ten Universities and the University of Chicago on the Negro. This pamphlet outlines specific steps

a university must take if equal educational opportunity is to be realized. These include setting the university's own house in order, aggressive programs with secondary schools, and clear commitment to social justice in the university's own community. The special opportunities opened up through cooperative and exchange programs with predominantly Negro colleges are presented. Francis Keppel calls the Blueprint priority reading, a model for the kind of serious and positive approach that must be taken.

4. Brumbaugh, A. J., State-Wide Planning and Coordination of Higher Education. Atlanta, Southern Regional Education Board, 1963. 50 p.

The author reviews the functions and powers of state higher educational coordinating agencies, with particular reference to the southern region, and assembles a list of recommended requirements for effective state planning and coordination of higher education. He suggests that coordinating agencies become highly independent and exercise explicit powers.

5. Bunnel, Kevin P., and Eldon Johnson, "Interinstitutional Cooperation." Samuel Baskin, ed., Higher Education, Some Newer Developments. New York, McGraw Hill, 1965, p. 246-72.

The authors distinguish between function-centered and institution-centered cooperation, and infer that the latter is more strictly interinstitutional cooperation. Such cooperation develops, in part, to achieve economies of scale; more significantly, it is a "groping for completeness" while dealing with new challenges. Cited advantages of cooperation are a united front, savings, and the opportunity to experiment. Limitations include the threat to autonomy, inadequate communication, self-interest, uniformity, and an inappropriate organizational structure. Cooperation is discussed under interstate compact agencies, large corporate groupings, federated multilateral arrangements, and bilateral programs. The authors feel that cooperation seems to hold something for everyone; however, it has inherent limitations and its "current popularity probably outruns its merit." The real question raised is whether a college, when facing an important issue, will act with others or for itself.

6. Chambers, M. M., The Campus and the People. Danville, Ill., Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1960. 75 p.; Chance and Choice in Higher Education. Bloomington, Ind., The Bloomcraft Press, 1965. 119 p.; Freedom and Repression in Higher Education. Bloomington, Ind., The Bloomcraft Press, 1965. 126 p.

These books contain the author's case for greater interinstitutional cooperation but with insistence that it be voluntary and university centered. In the opinion of the author, higher education knows best its own needs and does not require special prodding to assume public responsibilities. Compulsory state or national coordination and planning are therefore not required even though higher education receives ever-increasing public support. If Indiana's voluntary program of cooperation, not Conant's Shaping of Educational Policy, is taken as the model, needed regional and national responsibilities will be more effectively undertaken, he believes.

7. Doi, James, "Pressures to Increase Educational Productivity in Institutions." Current Issues in Higher Education, p. 112-14. 1965.

The author discusses current quality measurements of colleges and universities and the "productivity trap" they present. An example is the likelihood that there will be more concern with the number of student credit hours of instruction than with the quality of each hour's instruction. Doi's thesis, "Colleges and universities do not, as of now, possess valid measures of 'educational productivity,'" leads him to conclude that there are only two choices left: either permit the confusion to continue or launch a concerted effort to obtain and employ viable educational measurements. Since interinstitutional cooperation is heralded as a device for upgrading quality, the resolution of this problem is urgent.

8. Fishman, Joshua A., "Higher Education in a Megapolis." Journal of Higher Education, vol. 33, No. 3, p. 72-76. January, 1962.

The specialization and cooperation among colleges within commuting distance of each other is advocated to overcome excesses in institutional autonomy and to permit larger enrollments while yet maintaining quality instruction. The author shows that cooperation is not exclusively a need of "have not" colleges, and finds the major obstacle to cooperation to be "intramural parochialism."

9. Gibson, Raymond C., The Challenge of Leadership in Higher Education. Dubuque, Iowa, W. C. Brown, 1964. 362 p.

The author notes that the trend toward combinations among independent institutions of higher education parallels the actions by some large state universities to inhibit the growth of smaller institutions within their system or state. He also notes the new challenge posed by urban universities and the tendency of some private institutions to come under public control.

10. Havighurst, Robert J., American Higher Education in the 1960's. Columbus, Ohio State University Press, 1960. 92 p.

This book contains a social scientist's predictions for higher education in the sixties in terms of trends in economics, demography, and ideology. Cause and effect relationships involving social mobility and per capita income are used to explain factors in expansion, admissions, and other policies adopted by both public and private institutions. As the ecology of higher education changes around the crucial year 1965, a shift in concern is predicted from economics to ideology in institutional goals.

11. Howes, Raymond F., ed., Higher Education and the Society It Serves. Washington, American Council on Education, 1956. 103 p.

A collection of 14 statements presented at the annual meeting of the American Council on Education, 1956, by educators and representatives of industry, labor, agriculture, and local, State, and Federal governments. The statements represent the beginnings of exploration in cooperation between institutions of higher learning, commerce, and government.

12. Knight, Douglas M., ed., The Federal Government in Higher Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1960. 205 p.

This is a final summary by six members of the Seventeenth American Assembly (1960). It explores, historically and speculatively, the role of the Federal Government in higher education. It illuminates the pressures on institutions, the purposes of the Federal Government, and the necessity for the coordination of the two to reflect a true national policy for education.

13. Mayhew, Lewis B., "The Literature of Higher Education, 1965." Educational Record, vol. 47, No. 1, p. 18-49. Winter, 1966.

An annotated bibliography of books on higher education published in 1965. General overviews of higher education are found in 12 of the volumes discussed; 12 deal with students; 10 are concerned with faculty; 10 focus on international and comparative education; 9 on types of institutions; 8 involve the general problems of administration; 7 collegiate curricula. There are 4 histories, 3 books about teaching, 2 biographies, and 6 are uncategorized. Each of the annotations average about 200 words, and a bibliography of 86 items is included.

14. Pattillo, M. M., "Accreditation as a Protection Against Pressures." Journal of Higher Education, vol. 31, p. 301-06. June, 1960.

The author cites instances of institutions protecting themselves against local outside political pressures by threatening possible loss of accreditation for the school. He also states his belief that accrediting agencies may play some role in preventing undesirable Federal regulation in higher education.

See also:

15. Dobbins, Charles G., ed., The University, the City, and Urban Renewal: Report of a Regional Conference Sponsored by the American Council on Education and The West Philadelphia Corporation, Philadelphia, March 25, 1963. Washington, American Council on Education, 1963. 58 p.

16. Frankel, Charles, "New Initiatives in International Education." Journal of Higher Education, vol. 37, No. 3, p. 121-28. March, 1966.

17. Munger, Frank J., and Richard F. Fenno, Jr., National Politics and Federal Aid to Education. Syracuse, New York, Syracuse University Press, 1962. 193 p.

18. Pattillo, Manning M. and Donald M. Mackenzie, Eight Hundred Colleges Face the Future: A Preliminary Report of the Danforth Commission of Church Colleges and Universities. St. Louis, Mo., Danforth Foundation, 1965. 74 p.

19. Pegues, Franklin J., "Editorial: Mobility and the Expansion of Quality." Journal of Higher Education, vol. 37, No. 3, p. 163-65. March, 1966.

20. Watson, John H., III, Industry Aid to Education, A Research Report from the Conference Board: Public Affairs Study No. 1. New York, National Industrial Conference Board, 1965. 94 p.

The Interinstitutional Movement

21. Anderson, Wayne W., Cooperation Within American Higher Education. Washington, Association of American Colleges, 1964. 74 p.

This pamphlet contains listings of interinstitutional cooperative arrangements in undergraduate education, which were compiled on the basis of 300 inquiries to university and college administrators. The listing offers a short description of the program and a communications officer's address for 83 diverse cooperative relationships: bilateral agreements, area, state, and regional clusters, and national groupings. In addition, there are identifications of cooperative programs in other specific areas: adult education, non-Western studies, research, and secondary education.

22. Donovan, George F., "The Philosophy of Interinstitutional Cooperation in American Higher Education." George F. Donovan, ed., College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation, p. 3-18. Washington, Catholic University of America, 1965.

The author attempts to identify the characteristics of interinstitutional cooperation from the chief executive officer's point of view. The emphasis is on multilateral relationships rather than bilateral programs or university centers. Discussed are the major characteristics, purposes, challenges, and opportunities afforded by interinstitutional cooperation. Information was sought informally from existing relationships. The author sees interinstitutionalism as a major balance to public control and constructs an oligopolistic, self-regulating model of higher education.

23. Fitzroy, Herbert W. K., "Regional Cooperative Programs; Twenty-Four Virginia Institutions." George F. Donovan, ed., College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation. Washington, Catholic University of America, 1965.

The author, president of the University Center in Virginia, discusses the various kinds of cooperative relationships, both incidental and formal, which have emerged in higher education. He distinguishes between "disassociated actions of cooperation" and programs designed to upgrade an institution's educational capacity. He describes the many programs offered by the Virginia center, emphasizing its Research Council established to overcome limited opportunities for research in small colleges.

24. Jamrich, John X., "Interinstitutional Cooperation in Research and Instruction." College and University, vol. 40, No. 1, p. 25-34. Fall 1964.

The premise of the article is that despite continuing support for institutional autonomy, colleges are rapidly entering cooperative relationships. The inadequacies of the isolated college, the need to achieve

economies, the necessity to conserve human resources, and opportunities to expand research have led to increased cooperation. New programs take into account geographic proximity, program similarities, and common commitments among participants. The basic question continually presented is whether colleges are willing to research their needs and then to seek amelioration through the cooperative device. Existing programs in instruction, research, service, and general planning present examples of potential areas for cooperation. From effective cooperation come the possibilities of specialization in depth, efficient use of resources, better student programs, and greater influence for the college involved.

25. Johnson, Eldon L., "College Federations." Journal of Higher Education, vol. 36, No. 1, p. 1-9. January, 1966.

The author maintains that the distinctive college grouping is one which can effectively decide what to undertake in common, initiate and conduct imaginative and relevant projects, command enough resources to act, and reconcile central and peripheral power harmoniously and in mutual dependence. Effective communication appears to be the key to purposeful cooperation; it can be the biggest problem or provide the greatest benefits. Since the chief trouble with cooperation among colleges is that the program has little influence in the personal and academic lives of constituents, the author calls for ambitious and fundamental projects, an interlocking system of specialities, a jointly sponsored new college, or a joint research institute.

26. Koenker, Robert H., "Interinstitutional Co-operation at the Graduate Level." Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual Midwest Conference on Graduate Study and Research, p. 51-82. Iowa City, Iowa, Midwest Graduate Study and Research Foundation, 1962.

A list of predominantly bilateral graduate level cooperative arrangements of 112 colleges and universities. The names and descriptive data were supplied from the institutions which the author contacted in a 1961 study. The author notes that out of 151 institutions which did not have cooperative relationships in graduate work at the time of the study, one-third of them were in the process of developing such arrangements.

27. Kroepsch, Robert H. and Stephen M. Kaplan, "Interstate Cooperation and Coordination in Higher Education." Logan Wilson, ed., Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education, p. 174-90. Washington, American Council on Education, 1965.

The three major interstate compacts in higher education, the New England Board of Higher Education, the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, and the Southern Regional Education Board, are reviewed. Their birth, evolution, legal mandates, organization and financing are compared as they have pursued the mission of helping states and institutions pool their resources. The most successful pattern of cooperation has come when every participating segment feels that it will gain from the involvement. The major issues in regional education are the consequence of different perspectives on program.

28. Messersmith, James C., "Consortia and Related Institutional Arrangements." Logan Wilson, ed., Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education, p. 142-54. Washington, American Council on Education, 1965; and "Ideas and Patterns for Future Programs of Interinstitutional Cooperation." Current Issues in Higher Education, p. 150-53. 1962.

The current rapid expansion of the cooperative movement is presented within the framework of a classification system. (Cooperatives are bilateral and multilateral, research centers, inter- and intrastate efforts, urban cooperative ventures, and programs with outside agencies.) According to the author, the major problems ahead arise from inadequate reporting and inappropriate leadership: information should regularly be made available on planning, administration, financing and evaluation; and cooperative executives must promote trust, sharing and institutional self-studies. Properly oriented administrators are offered guidelines for the establishment of cooperative programs: analysis of mutual benefits, study of mutual needs, establishment of continuing interinstitutional communication, delineation of institutional roles, and appropriate reporting. Broader, more formalized geographic groupings with specialized staffs are predicted, as are new programs, and links with government and industry. The twofold purpose of cooperative activity is to upgrade quality and to direct resources to national problems.

29. Millett, John D., "State Planning for Higher Education." Educational Record, p. 223-30. Summer 1965.

The author, chancellor of the Ohio State Board of Regents and chairman of the ACE's Commission on Administrative Affairs, tells from personal experience of fears and pressures in higher education which have produced the trend toward statewide planning. The pressures include the meeting of increased costs, expanded enrollments, declining quality, and unused opportunities for research; the fears relate to apprehensions about obtaining needed plant, personnel, and budget. Educational

objectives defined in terms of performance achieved with a given input of resources rather than quantitative indicators (expressed in dollars, teaching loads, or research programs) should become the standard if quality in higher education is to be maintained, the author asserts.

30. "Cooperative Relations in Higher Education." School and Society, vol. 94, No. 227, 43 p. April, 1966.

Directed toward higher education administrators, the articles in this special double issue were presented at the 53rd Schoolmen's Week Conference at the University of Pennsylvania. William E. Cadbury, Jr. exemplifies cooperative relations involving liberal arts colleges by describing nine different arrangements. He indicates that the real use of cooperation--to enrich the intellectual lives of students and faculties--is only now beginning. Clyde E. Blocker calls for increased communication to facilitate the essential cooperation between two-year and four-year colleges and suggests that four-year institutions determine what problems exist and find effective ways of working them out with the two-year colleges. Past interactions between the Government and institutions of higher education are briefly reviewed by John W. Shirley who points out possible deleterious effects on students, faculties, and institutions poised by burgeoning federally sponsored research. Predicting ever-growing Federal support, he urges both educators and Government to face up to the issues.

31. Wittich, John J., ed., College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation: Proceedings of a Conference on College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation, held at Princeton, N.J., 1962. Corning, N.Y., College Center of the Finger Lakes, 1962. 87 p.

Comprising this conference were officers involved with two patterns of interinstitutional cooperation: college centers, which may involve totally dissimilar colleges whose prime common element is their geographic proximity, and associations of colleges which are physically removed from each other but come together to attack common problems. The national status of interinstitutional cooperation was seen as being rapidly growing and academically oriented. Among the devices employed to discover and initiate projects, the following were considered significant: convening individual departmental representatives and departmental committees; holding interfaculty conferences; and collectively analyzing pooled committee reports which explore potential areas for cooperation. The use of "seed money" to stimulate new cooperative projects was advocated, while established groups were urged to use consultants, incorporate, and undertake small scale ventures without waiting for outside financial support.

Cooperation Among Special Interest Groups

32. Dominic, Sister Rose, "Cooperation Among Colleges for Religious." George F. Donovan, ed., College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation, p. 19-33. Washington, Catholic University of America Press, 1965.

This is a discussion of the establishment of the Sister Formation Conference and its cooperative programs in Roman Catholic institutions involved in Sister education. Higher education of limited quality in these 93 institutions is related to their size, isolation, and increased number. Cooperative programs are advanced as the solution and an outline of what this involves is presented.

33. Fitzroy, Herbert W. K., Interinstitutional Cooperation: Hopes and Reality. Richmond, University Center in Virginia, 1962. 13 p.

After emphasizing the need for cooperation among the relatively small, modestly endowed colleges--which must absorb the increasing enrollments in higher education--the article explains why cooperative programs have succeeded at the University Center in Virginia. The text was an address delivered to the Conference on College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation, Princeton, N.J., April 1962.

34. Hill, Alfred T., "Cooperation Among Small Colleges." George F. Donovan, ed., College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation, p. 34-46. Washington, Catholic University of America Press, 1965.

The author, executive secretary of the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, offers data from a questionnaire returned by 60 small colleges indicating that 4 small colleges in 10 are already engaged in cooperative programs and 2 are considering the idea. Even more colleges would be involved, it is said, if practical matters such as scheduling and tuition could be adjusted. Suggested is a "master teacher" to be shared by a group of developing colleges.

35. McGrath, Earl J., ed., Cooperative Long-Range Planning in Liberal Arts Colleges. New York, Institute of Higher Education, 1964. 108 p.

The presentations in this book were conference papers delivered by liberal arts college presidents. The central concern was the administrative means to achieve greater institutional excellence and financial security. Policy development as a joint faculty-administration undertaking is discussed, and ways to promote institutional research and to better

define the educational purpose for liberal arts colleges are pointed out as relevant for interinstitutional cooperation.

36. _____, The Predominantly Negro Colleges and Universities in Transition. New York, Institute of Higher Education, 1965. 204 p.

This is a complete institutional analysis of the 123 predominantly Negro colleges and universities in the United States which enroll over half of all Negroes attending institutions of higher education. In addition to plant, curricula, and instructional programs, it covers the context to which higher education for Negroes exists. These institutions vary widely in quality and character, and generally suffer from inadequate financial and personnel resources. The author recommends maintaining and strengthening most if not all of these institutions and advocates wide employment of interinstitutional cooperation as an upgrading device.

37. Meeth, L. Richard. "Breaking Racial Barriers, Part II: Interinstitutional Cooperative Program Between Colleges for Negroes and Colleges for Whites." The Journal of Higher Education, vol. 37, No. 4, p. 211-17. April, 1966.

One in a three-part series on the Negro student in higher education, written mainly for administrators. Differentiated are cooperative programs which are denominationally run, regionally constructed, and those which are cross-regional in emphasis. Programs of each type are enumerated and described. The problem of the concentration of nearly all cooperative programs in a few of the more "established" predominantly Negro institutions in also touched upon.

38. Poorman, Richard O., C.S.C., "The Small College: A Second Look." The Catholic Education Review, vol. 63, No. 3, p. 145-56. March, 1965.

The author is the assistant vice president for academic affairs at Notre Dame University and writes in reaction to the proliferation of small Roman Catholic Colleges. He enumerates the pressures for establishing these colleges as well as the problems in quality and quantity which result. Characteristics of underdevelopment, especially those related to Roman Catholic colleges, are identified. The article is addressed to Church governing boards as an appeal for a refocusing from quantity to quality in Roman Catholic higher education.

39. Rose, Harold M., "Teacher-Exchange Programs." Journal of Higher Education, vol. 37, No. 6, p. 319-24. June, 1966.

This article discusses some of the problems of interaction encountered when northern institutions cooperate with predominantly Negro institutions. The author tries to ascertain the climate for North-South interinstitutional cooperation in various types of institutions. He discusses problems in programs of teacher exchanges, differentiating three types of teacher exchanges and the kinds of institutions which find each most suitable. He notes the difference in development among predominantly Negro colleges and makes suggestions for more appropriate future cooperative programs.

40. Salerno, Sister M. Dolores, Patterns of Interinstitutional Cooperation in American Catholic Higher Education--1964. Washington, Catholic University of America Press, 1966. 292 p.

This study covers the universe of Catholic higher education engaged in interinstitutional cooperation. The type, size, regional distribution, and administration of 155 cooperative programs are described. Bilateral and multilateral programs are analyzed separately. Selective successful programs are presented along with discussion of advantages and disadvantages experienced by participating colleges. The author documents a rapid growth in cooperation both among Catholic institutions and in wider ecumenical circles. While much cooperation among colleges in close proximity is noted, distance does not seem to be a barrier.

41. Stewart, W. Blair, "Cooperation Among Liberal Arts Colleges." Liberal Education, vol. 46, No. 1, p. 66-71. March, 1960.

In improving the educational process, urges the author, cooperative relationships can contribute most to higher education. The cooperative design, conduct, and evaluation of educational experiments give promise of upgrading instruction and of maturing attitudes and procedures. Hampshire College in Western Massachusetts is pointed out as exemplifying the right direction for cooperative efforts. Programs of the Associated Colleges of the Midwest are used to illustrate how cooperation can improve quality, permit specialization, and provide financial savings.

42. _____, "Cooperation by Independent Colleges: The Associated Colleges of the Midwest." Liberal Education, vol. 47, No. 3, p. 360-66. October, 1961.

Using the Associated Colleges of the Midwest as an example, its Director describes the "economies of scale" that can result from relevant interinstitutional cooperation. Basically, these economies are created

by a fuller utilization of physical and human resources made possible by combining the facilities of colleges which have common needs and desires. Many situations where cooperation is relevant involve such economies and still allow the colleges to "retain the educational advantages they see in restricted enrollments."

See also:

43. Expanding Opportunities/The Negro and Higher Education. American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1965.

44. Meeth, L. Richard, "Breaking Racial Barriers, Part I: Interracial Student-Exchange Programs." Journal of Higher Education, vol. 37, No. 3, p. 137-43. March, 1966.

Earlier Studies in Interinstitutional Cooperation

45. Klein, Arthur J. and Franklin V. Thomas, Co-operation and Coordination in Higher Education. Washington, American Council on Education, 1938; and Sanford, Daniel S., Jr., Interinstitutional Agreements in Higher Education. New York, Bureau of Publication, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1934.

The above studies represent two of the earliest works on interinstitutional cooperation.

46. Eckert, Ruth E., "Patterns of Interinstitutional Cooperation." Current Issues in Higher Education, p. 96-102. Washington, Association for Higher Education, 1953.

A comprehensive overview of interinstitutionalism as it had developed to the early fifties. Pressures are listed, programs are categorized, geographical considerations are delineated, and 10 principles involved in establishing cooperative relationships are listed. The author's basic concern in this address is with the use of cooperation to develop academic excellence.

47. Ertell, Merton W., Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education. Albany, University of the State of New York, the State Education Department, 1957. 118 p.

This volume summarizes interinstitutional cooperation in New York

State, listing and describing all programs which were initiated before 1957. References to programs outside of the state are also included. Interinstitutionalism is discussed for its potential for expansion and specialization in higher education. Recommendations are for greater voluntary cooperation especially in nonacademic areas. Appended is a comprehensive bibliography.

48. Martorana, S. V., James C. Messersmith, and Lawrence O. Nelson, Cooperative Projects Among Colleges and Universities. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1961. OE-50020, Circular No. 649, 45 p.

The publication provides a case-history description of some successful programs of interinstitutional cooperation, their scope of operation, the character of cooperative arrangements, administrative procedures, provisions for evaluation, and qualitative factors. Bilateral and multilateral cooperative agreements on the local, state, and regional levels are documented. Two U.S. Office of Education conferences on interinstitutional cooperation are discussed. Factors conducive and deterrent to cooperative arrangements are explained, and principles and guidelines for the establishment of interinstitutional programs are presented. The authors also include a selective bibliography covering the period 1957-61.

49. Newsom, Carroll V., "Furthering Interinstitutional Cooperation." Addresses on Current Issues in Higher Education, 1951, p. 79-83. Washington, National Education Association, 1951.

Report on trends in cooperation as seen in 1951, especially concerning programs in New York State. The futility of institutional competition is cited, and programs in teacher education, community instruction, international relations, educational broadcasting, and library cooperation are proposed.

50. Western Governors' Conference, Western Regional Cooperation in Higher Education. Chicago, Council of State Governors, 1951. 30 p.

This report enumerates the factors which brought about the formation of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education in 1949. WICHE is a cooperative program in professional education, modeled after the Southern Regional Education Board. The WICHE program is spelled out along with a projected profile of higher education for the region.

Educational Functions

51. EDUCOM. Bulletin of the Interuniversity Communications Council, I, 1966.

EDUCOM, supported by a grant from the Kellogg Foundation, seeks to encourage and coordinate university use of the information sciences. The project aims to devise practical programs for harnessing "electronic thinking tools" to college curricula, research projects, and administrative services. This Bulletin appears monthly.

52. Deitch, Kenneth M., Seymour Harris, and Alan Levensohn, eds., Challenge and Change in American Education. Berkeley, Calif., McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1965.

A collection of essays by 33 educators attending the Harvard seminar on American education (1961-62) which focuses on Government involvement in educational planning and management. The discussions question which level of Government control can most effectively assist higher education in increasing quality. One essay suggests the outdatedness of state education departments and the need to reorganize them as "clearinghouses" to coordinate Federal and local activities. Others are concerned about the appropriation of Federal education funds: should they be made directly to the institutions or disbursed through the states? Also seriously questioned was the use of tests as the critical factor for college admissions.

53. Henderson, Algo D., Policies and Practices in Higher Education. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1960. 321 p.

The text, originating from a University of Michigan course taught by the author and intended primarily as a text for college teaching and administration preparation, discusses the changing concepts and purposes of higher education in terms of more fully developing human resources. In particular, it raises questions concerning the nature and quality of programs to be offered in order to accommodate students of varying intellectual abilities, as well as administrative and financial problems related to broadening the base of higher education.

54. Innovation and Experimentation in Education, A Progress Report of the Panel on Educational Research and Development to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, the Director of the National Science Foundation, and the Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1964. 79 p.

This panel was charged with exploring the contribution that research and development could make to educational needs. Negro college presidents and professors, invited to present a program of action, first offered the suggestion of linking northern universities with predominantly Negro colleges in the South. Ideas associated with Jerrold R. Zacharias, chairman of the panel, concerning curricular and pedagogical reform, as well as experimental systems and services for education are discussed in detail. This document provides the direction for much of the interinstitutional cooperation that has occurred since 1964. Particularly valuable are the remarks of author Ralph Ellison in the appendix, which provide balance to an otherwise mechanical approach.

55. Riesman, David, "Alterations in Institutional Attitudes and Behavior." Logan Wilson, ed., Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education, p. 66-73. Washington, American Council on Education, 1965.

The author notes the elites in the academic guilds and their power over presidents and universities. He indicates that segments of the faculty pull their loyalties away from the administration and community while the administration and the student body sink into provincialism and parochialism. The author stresses the need for research and development in higher education itself, while warning that the ranks of the teacher-scholars must be increased vis-á-vis the teacher-researchers.

56. Schultz, Raymond E., and W. Hugh Stickler, "Vertical Extension of Academic Programs in Institutions of Higher Education." Educational Record, p. 231-41. Summer, 1965.

The authors, both professors of higher education at Florida State University, survey the general phenomenon of vertical extension in programming to the four-, five-, and six-year levels. Implicit in their study are the standards and institutional characteristics and planning procedures which effect the relative success or failure of an individual expansion program. Also implicit are recommendations for assessing the capability of an institution to face the problem of vertical extension.

57. Taylor, R. Robb, ed., University and Community, Proceedings of a Conference of the Association of Urban Universities. April, 1963. 147 p.

The proceedings of this conference were directed toward determining those areas of research and evaluation where urban universities could make a "unique contribution in assisting urban areas in meeting

their underlying needs." Research and development in industry, special responsibilities toward the culturally deprived, and guidance of urban policy decisions were the specific topics under consideration. There was also investigation of university urban studies programs which emphasized the need for training urban professionals with an interdisciplinary background.

See also:

58. The Administration of Federally Sponsored University Research: Papers Presented at the Conference on Administration of Federally Sponsored University Research, Atlanta, Georgia, April 29 - May 1, 1962. Atlanta, Southern Regional Education Board, 1963. 43 p.

59. Conflicts Between the Federal Research Programs and the Nation's Goals for Higher Education: Eighteenth Report by the Committee on Government Operations. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1965. 74 p.

60. Meeth, L. Richard, "Breaking Racial Barriers, Part III: Scholarships for Negro Students in Predominantly White Colleges and Universities." Journal of Higher Education, vol. 37, No. 5, p. 246-52. May, 1966.

61. Summary of State Legislation Affecting Higher Education in the South. Atlanta, Southern Regional Education Board, 1965. 40 p.

62. Weinberg, Meyer, ed., Learning Together: A Book on Integrated Education. Chicago, Integrated Education Associates, 1964. 222 p.

63. The White House Conference on Education: Consultants Papers, vol. 1. July 20-21, 1965. 78 p.

64. Wiggins, Samuel P., The Desegregation Era in Higher Education. Berkeley, Calif., McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1966. 106 p.

Case Studies

65. Associated Midwest Universities: Organization - Program - Activities. February, 1965. 27 p.

This booklet is directed to faculty members and graduate students. It describes the functions of the AMU as a mechanism for cooperation between member colleges and the Argonne National Laboratory. Possible areas for future cooperation are advanced.

66. Buszek, Beatrice, "Cornell University and Hampton Institute." Expanding Opportunities - The Negro and Higher Education, vol. 2, No. 1. Washington, American Council on Education, January, 1965.

The cooperative relationship between Cornell and Hampton is described from the latter's point of view. Possibilities for future activity are included. Most noteworthy is the frank expression of the pitfalls in a one-way exchange from the big university to the small college.

67. "The Compact for Education: Views from Higher Education." Educational Record, vol. 47, No. 1, p. 79-121. Winter, 1966.

Four articles about the Compact and its final text present pro and con arguments as well as descriptive data. Allan M. Cartter reviews the development and implementation of the idea from the 1964 publication of James B. Conant's Shaping Educational Policy to the unofficial adoption of the Educational Commission a year later. The dissenting arguments and fears from higher education are presented, along with the author's assessment of the calculated risk of involving political leaders in the nationwide planning of education.

The father of the concept, James B. Conant, suggests that the Educational Commission can assist universities in developing minimum standards for the licensing and operation of all institutions of higher education, expand opportunities for graduate study, present issues and facts about the "junior college problem," and review the demands upon universities for public service and their resultant problems. Conant feels that the type of relation between the Commission and higher education is dependent largely on the cooperation of administrators of the Compact and professors in outstanding institutions.

In direct opposition to Conant's views, Herbert Longenecker, president of Tulane University, explains widely held reservations. Not only do administrators and professors disapprove of the "small group" development of the Compact and the underrepresentation of higher education at the September 1965 ratification meeting, they also fear the governmental power it endorses. Longenecker points out that state suggested standards of accreditation are antithetical to the needed self-

governance of colleges and universities. The Compact contains no limitations on the range of subjects upon which policy can be "recommended" and also provides for the transmittal of these suggestions to the appropriate governmental agency. Longenecker fears that this concentration of power may be detrimental to the future of American higher education. A college or university cannot become in effect an agency of the Government without losing the independence essential for carrying on its true educational functions. He encourages any state which has not yet ratified the Compact not to do so.

An endorsement of the power which the states would gain is presented by James Allen, Commissioner of Education of the State of New York. To continue the local-state-national balance of educational power, while realizing the inevitability of increased Federal participation in education, leads to a recognition of the need for strengthening state programs, he believes. Although he does not view the Compact as an action body, Allen feels that it will provide for needed support without diluting the strong influence of the universities.

68. The Cooperative Program in the Humanities, Report Number Two: An Account and an Invitation. Duke University and the University of North Carolina, 1965. 59 p.

Started in 1963 with a Ford Foundation grant, 11 institutions in Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina are linked to Duke and Chapel Hill to strengthen the region's teaching in the humanities. The 1965-66 program included 16 fellowships for teachers from participating institutions, 8 student replacement teachers sent out from Duke University and the University of North Carolina; 4 visiting professors and 2 editorial interns. Evaluations by participants are also included.

69. Fitzroy, Herbert W. K., Cooperation Among All of the Institutions in an Area. Richmond, University Center in Virginia, 1964. 5 p.

Descriptions of the programs currently in operation at the University Center in Virginia are presented by the president of the center. Also pointed out are problems that have been encountered and programs that are anticipated. This statement was originally made before a panel at the 1964 American Council on Education meeting in San Francisco.

70. Jolly, Joan, and Charles E. Madden, Amplified Telephone as a Teaching Medium. Columbia, Mo., Stephens College, 1965. 69 p.

The 1963-64 interinstitutional tele-lecture series coordinated at Stephens College, Mo., is explained and evaluated in terms of technical and instructional benefits and drawbacks.

71. Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education, Profiles of Member Colleges and Universities. 2nd ed. 20 p.

Prepared to introduce students to the Kansas City area colleges and universities, this booklet provides general information and highly informative profiles of the 16 member institutions of the Kansas City Regional Council.

72. 19th Annual Report of the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies, Inc., for the year ending June 30, 1965.

A report on the activities of the Oak Ridge Institute (composed of 40 southern universities and the Oak Ridge National Laboratory) for the 1964-65 school year. Information provided clearly shows the interaction of the Federal Government and the associated universities on the institute's activities: fellowships in nuclear science, engineering, and health physics; a program for faculty research at several AEC laboratories; a traveling lecture program, a postdoctoral fellowship program; a student trainee program; a medical division; and institutes for special training.

73. Pfautz, Harold W., Narrative Report of the Brown-Tougaloo Cooperative Program, a report made to the Fund for the Advancement of Education. June, 1965.

A discussion of the establishment and administration of the Brown-Tougaloo program, one of the earliest and most cooperative activities linking a northern university and a predominantly Negro college. This report presents the development of the program which has become a prototype for many later cooperative efforts.

74. Salwak, Stanley F., "The Need for Cooperation and the CIC Response." Educational Record. Summer, 1964.

The development of some specific cooperative programs (biometeorology, Far Eastern languages, traveling scholars) and the history of their implementation through the Committee on Institutional Cooperation are discussed in the light of needs and benefits for the university and its greater community.

75. Southern Regional Education Board 1965/66, Annual Report, 1965-66. Atlanta, The Board. 32 p.

This annual report contains a description of established and planned programs aimed at upgrading the quality of education in the South. Although the long-range purpose of the SREB is to improve all universities, the report of the 1965 Policy Committee suggests emphasis on studying and developing Negro colleges to improve and increase their role in providing public education. Listings of universities and colleges cooperating in various SREB programs are given according to area of cooperation.

76. Stoke, Stuart M., "Cooperation at the Undergraduate Level." George F. Donovan, ed., College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation. Washington, Catholic University of America Press, 1965.

The author, who is the coordinator of the program between Amherst, Mt. Holyoke, Smith, and the University of Massachusetts, discusses what can be accomplished comparatively between institutions of approximately the same level of development and close geographical proximity. The absence of any extended cooperation between departments and the basically ad hoc nature of the entire program appear as the underlying limitations in the existing arrangement.

See also:

77. "The Emphasis is on Practicality." Industrial Development, p. 39-51. August, 1963.

78. First Annual Report of the Inter-University Program: The University of Buffalo, Cornell University, the University of Rochester, Syracuse University. June, 1962.

79. The Inter-University Council of the Dallas and Fort Worth Metropolitan Areas, Annual Reports, 1964 and 1965. Glenn C. Sparks, "Academic Institutions in North Texas Organize for Cooperation." Reprint from the Texas Library Journal. Spring, 1965.

80. New England Board of Higher Education, Annual Reports of 1962, 1963, 1964. New England's Academic Common Market. Washington, Committee for the Advancement of School Administration, American

Association of School Administrators, 1963. 28 p. Regional Cooperation in New England Higher Education: The First Five Years of NEBHE. Winchester, Mass., New England Board of Higher Education, 1965. 24 p. Proceedings of NEBHE Workshop on Institutional Research, Reports of 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965.

REACTIONS

In order for this second series of "New Dimensions in Higher Education" to better serve the needs of colleges and universities throughout the nation, reader reaction is herewith being sought. In this instance, with respect to Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education, the following questions are asked:

1. Can you suggest other completed research, the results of which would add significantly to this report?

2. What problems related to this subject should be given the highest priority, in terms of further research?

3. What suggestions do you have for colleges and universities interested in interinstitutional arrangements?

4. What has your institution done, or what does it propose to do, in the broad area on interinstitutional cooperation? What types of arrangements have been most beneficial to your institution? Least beneficial?

5. What can the United States Office of Education do to encourage or facilitate beneficial interinstitutional arrangements?

Kindly address reactions to:

Dr. Winslow R. Hatch
Bureau of Higher Education Research
Office of Education
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D. C. 20202